Rao dealt with this matter, the settlement was in full swing, and the settlement and the survey then went on hand in hand. The present cost of a separate resurvey would be considerably higher. We are trying our level best to bring up our land records at as little cost as possible. We do not say that a supplemental survey is the only proper remedy. Statistics have been called for in respect of the Trivandrum and Chirayinkil taluks which are now ripe for resettlement to see whether a supplemental survey would be sufficient or whether a resurvey is necessary. In taluks surveyed under the *tak* system, my impression is that a resurvey is not really necessary and that a supplemental survey would be enough. The above two taluks were surveyed under the *tak* system. I do not think that the present system of land records maintenance is open to half the faults to which the old system was liable. We are trying to avoid those faults. I do not claim perfection for our methods. There may be some defects as regards details and these can only be remedied by experience and in course of time. The work of the Assistant Tahsildar is in its nature unpopular, as nobody likes to be told that he has made an encroachment and that he should pay a fine and vacate the encroachment. We have imposed restrictions in regard to the payment of fines. The rules lay down that, in cases where encroachments are not objectionable, no fine need be levied. The rules have been made as liberal as possible.

9. Oodukoor system of tenure and the enjoyment of lands thereunder.

Mr. A. P. P. Nadar (Member, Municipal Council, Kuzhittura) said that *oodukoor* was a peculiar arrangement prevalent in the taluks of Neyyattinkara, Vilavankod and Kalkulam, under which one and the same landed property was owned and enjoyed by different persons in different proportions without dividing their shares by metes and bounds. The produce was taken in common and divided among the several sharers in the proportions of their shares. The title of the several sharers was separate and independent of one another; but the possession could be said to be neither separate nor joint. This system could not rightly come under the category of either joint tenancy or tenancy-in-common, though it was in certain respects analogous to the latter. Hence it was a tenancy in itself and might be called the *oodukoor* tenancy. The system originated out of difficulties in the way of effecting partition. It seemed to be of recent origin, for it did not exist either at the time of the first land revenue settlement of the State in 926 M. E. or at the later settlements of 948 or 977. In 1012 it was recognised in the Sirkar accounts, but only in the case of a very few holdings. At the last settlement, however, *pattas* were indiscriminately granted not only for all *oodukoor* shares, but *oodukoor pattas* were granted also for lands which had been divided, improved and enjoyed separately. The grant of *oodukoor pattas* for those lands, while such *pattas* should have been granted only for the old trees standing on them, created considerable confusion and made the revenue records tell a different tale from what the actual title and enjoyment of hundreds of holdings ought to do actually. That and the great difficulty of enjoying properties in such small *oodukoor* shares were the causes of endless quarrels, civil suits and criminal cases. In the opinion of the Member the system was responsible for more than 50 per cent. of the criminal cases and about 75 per cent. of the civil suits in the taluks of Vilavankod and Neyyattinkara and also for the disproportionately high files and the tough nature of the suits of those taluks. He added that the system had crippled the productive power of those taluks and had caused great inconvenience and loss to the people. As *oodukoor* tenants very seldom co-operated with one another to improve their lands, and as, according to that system, if any one of them made any improvement, the benefit of it ordinarily went to all sharers alike, there was no incentive for any individual to improve *oodukoor* lands. Almost all *oodukoor* holdings were, therefore, found devoid of any permanent and valuable improvements. In conclusion, the Member made the following suggestions to prevent the multiplication and facilitate the gradual abolition of the system :—

(1) Either suits for partition of *oodukoor* properties should be made free of all costs, or they should be made cheap and compulsory, in which case the cost must be made a charge on the property.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(2) Suits for partition should be made cognisable by a special officer appointed for the purpose who should be empowered to effect partition in person.

(3) The above suggestions might necessitate the enactment of a special Regulation or some amendment or change in the existing law which should be made by the Government in view of the immense benefit which would accrue to the people.

(4) The Government should in future refuse to recognise *oodukoor* in the revenue and other Government records.

Since the subject was both important and complicated, he requested that the Government might appoint a committee of officials and non-officials to enquire into the matter and make the necessary suggestions for abolishing the system.

Dewan's reply.—The suggestion of the Member is vague and indefinite, and, I fear, impracticable also. The representation will, however, be referred to the Land Revenue Commissioner for remarks and the matter will be considered on receipt of his report.

10. Desirability of not commencing resettlement without resurvey.

Mr. A. Mahomed Khan (Member, Kunnattur Taluk) spoke on the desirability of commencing resettlement operations in the taluks which had become ripe for such resettlement, only after the completion of a preliminary resurvey. He pointed out that the original scheme of land records work had undergone modifications and had become so much attenuated in practice that, instead of the anomaly and confusion of the last survey and settlement being a thing of the past, the present arrangement only served to worsen the prevailing confusion. The hardships and inconveniences to which the land-owning classes had become subject consequent on the deflection of the Survey and Settlement Departments from their original programme had, with lapse of time and subsequent neglect, now become almost intolerable. The indifferent original survey had only been further spoiled by the untrained settlement agency, and the scope of land records work intended to set right those defects had now been whittled down to such an extent that it did not touch even the fringe of survey. He stated that the last survey and settlement had completely failed of their object and that the half-hearted attempts subsequently made had only further complicated the existing confusion. The village maps and the incomplete subdivision sketches were partially unsatisfactory and partially unreliable and the conditions that prevailed in the period anterior to the last survey and settlement were in operation even to-day though in a slightly modified form. To illustrate the above he stated that the village maps and subdivision sketches prepared were of very little use, that discrepancies between actual and recorded areas formed the rule, instead of being the exception, that the issue of *pattas* for *puduval*, *pokkuvaravu*, etc., had been almost completely ignored, that the tax-receipt books did not show the survey numbers to which the tax related, that the *pakuthies* were almost wholly manned by irresponsible and ill-educated striplings, that there were no sketches of any kind whatever for most of the subdivisions entered in the *tandaper*, and that the *puduval* sketches made by the Revenue Department were worse than the subdivision sketches of the Settlement Department. Lastly, he requested the Government to openly declare that they would not go back upon the policy laid down in their order on the Final Settlement Report of the State in the matter of resettlement and that they would not launch a settlement scheme behind the back of the people without carrying out a careful and accurate resurvey.

Dewan's reply.—I have listened to the Member very attentively. While a good deal of what the Member says in regard to the condition of land records in the State is quite correct, I am afraid that he has not made out a case for a resurvey. He has not clearly perceived the difference between a resurvey and the conduct and completion of land records operations. A resurvey becomes necessary only when the frame-work of the survey has become faulty. He has not said how the present frame-work is faulty. He says that survey fields do not represent holdings. In no country that I know of is it so. In Madras, where the *ryotwari* system is most

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly